## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

RICHARD URESTI,	) FILED: JUNE 26 , 2008
	) 08CV3656
Plaintiff,	) JUDGE GOTTSCHALL
<b>v.</b>	MAGISTRATE JUDGE KEYS
	) NF
MSI TESTING & ENGINEERING,	)
INC.,	)
	)
Defendant.	)

### **COMPLAINT**

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, RICHARD URESTI ("URESTI"), by his attorneys, KIMMEL & KIEFER, P.C., and for his Complaint against MSI TESTING & ENGINEERING, INC. ("MSI") states the following:

#### **JURISDICTION**

- 1. This action arises pursuant to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 621 et seq. ("ADEA") and pursuant to Illinois statute.
- 2. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §626 et seq. of the ADEA, and the doctrine of pendent jurisdiction.
  - 3. Plaintiff is a resident of Lyons, Illinois and is a citizen of the State of Illinois.
- 4. On information and belief, Defendant MSI is an Illinois corporation licensed to do business in the state of Illinois and doing business in the State of Illinois in Melrose Park, Illinois.
- 5. At all times relevant, Defendant has employed 20 or more employees. The Defendant was and is, therefore, an employer as defined by Section 11(b) of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. §630(b).
- 6. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant was engaged in an industry affecting commerce as defined in by Section 11(b) of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. §630(b).

Case 1:08-cv-03656

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE PREREQUISITES**

- 7. In or about November 19, 2007, Plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") which was cross-filed with the Illinois Department of Human Rights ("IDHR"). The charge alleged discrimination on the basis of age. A true and complete copy of the charge of discrimination is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the EEOC or the IDHR sent a notice of the charge to Defendant and that the Defendant has received notice of same.
- 9. On March 25, 2008, the EEOC issued a Notice of Right to Sue letter, which was received by counsel for Plaintiff on March 28, 2008. A true and complete copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 10. The EEOC, the Plaintiff and a representative of Defendant have had an opportunity to participate in conciliation of the charges during the period of time that the charge has pended with both agencies, without reaching agreement.
  - 11. The EEOC has not filed suit concerning the matters described in the charge.

#### **COUNT I**

## **DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE**

- 12. Plaintiff was hired by MSI in January 2005 as a Shop Supervisor.
- In April 2007, upon return from his vacation, Plaintiff was told that he 13. was demoted from Shop Supervisor to Senior Machinist.
- On August 2, 2007 Plaintiff was terminated for alleged insubordination. 14. However, the one of the employees, Orlando (under 40), has hung a noose over a black employee's work area and has used the "N" word on several occasions throughout the

workplace and in front of management. Although he has been written up for these incidents, he is still working at MSI. In fact, Orlando has bragged about the fact that he can get away with this type of behavior.

15. Plaintiff was discriminated against based on his age, Plaintiff being over the age of forty (DOB: 7/2/62), in violation of the ADEA.

#### WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Enjoin Defendant Company from discriminating on the basis of age in the terms and conditions of employment of its employees;
- B. Award, against the Defendant Company and in favor of Plaintiff actual damages for loss of revenue, including back pay, incurred by the Plaintiff as a result of the discrimination against him;
- C. Award, against the Defendant Company and in favor of Plaintiff compensation for the loss of benefits resulting from his termination;
  - D. Award Plaintiff liquidated damages as provided by the ADEA;
- E. Award Plaintiff reasonable attorney fees and other costs incurred by this action; and
- F. Award Plaintiff such other and further relief as may be equitable and just.

#### **COUNT II**

# CLAIM FOR RETALIATORY DISCHARGE

- 16. Plaintiff hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 15 into this paragraph 16.
- 17. On July 27, 2007, Plaintiff suffered a work related injury.

- 18. On July 30, 2007, Plaintiff sought medical treatment for the injury at a hospital.
- 19. On August 1, 2007, Plaintiff reported back to work and informed the Defendant that he needed to be on light duty.
  - 20. On August 2, 2007, Plaintiff was terminated.
- 21. At the time of his termination, the Defendant was aware that Plaintiff had suffered a work related injury and that he intended to assert his rights under the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act.
  - 22. The Illinois Workers' Compensation Act states the following:

It shall be unlawful for any employer, individually or through any insurance company or service or adjustment company, to discharge or to threaten to discharge, or to refuse to rehire or recall to active service in a suitable capacity an employee because of the exercise of his or her rights or remedies granted to him or her by this Act. (820 ILCS 305/4(h).

- 23. Plaintiff was an employee covered and protected under the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act.
- 24. Plaintiff was discharged because he had notified the Defendant of his work related injury, and that he intended to pursue his rights under the Act in violation of 820 ILCS 305/4(h).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this honorable Court enter an order in Plaintiff's favor:

- A. Awarding Plaintiff compensatory damages for all of the back pay, benefits, and all other proximate damages incurred by Plaintiff as a result of the Defendant Company's unlawful discharge of Plaintiff;
- B. Granting Plaintiff an award of punitive damages against Defendant Company in an amount sufficient to protect Illinois citizens and Illinois public policy from

the likelihood that the Defendant Company will continue to retaliate against employees who exercise their right to file worker's compensation for work related injuries.

C. Granting Plaintiff whatever other relief that the Court deems just and equitable.

## **JURY DEMAND**

25. Plaintiff demands trial by jury.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Lesa S. Kiefer
Lesa S. Kiefer, one of the attorneys appearing on behalf of Richard Uresti

KIMMEL & KIEFER, P.C. 130 North Cuyler Avenue Suite 200 Oak Park, Illinois 60302 (708) 386-9791

ZX CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION	Charac	Presented To	Anennylle	s) Charge No(s):
CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION  turn is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclused Privacy Act Statement and other information before completing this form.	ΙĒ	FEPA 4	100.731	008-00911
\ <sup>0</sup>	<u>    X</u>	EEOC		
Illinois Department O	7 Human Ki	gnts		and EEOC
State or local Ages	ocy, if any			
Name (indicate Mr., Ms., Ahy.)		Home Phane (Inst. Area	0455140	Date of Sirth.
Mr. Richard Uresti		(708) 447-6608		07/02/62
	s, IL 60534			
Named is the Employer, Labor Organization, Employment Agency, Apprenticest Discriminated Against Me or Others. If more than two, list under PARTICULAR	hip Committee, or		ent Agency	That I Believe
Name		No. Employees, Members	Phone	No. (Include Area Code
MSI Testing & Engineering				
	e and JIP Code	Constant	_	
1390 N. 25 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Meln	ose Park, I	L 60160		
Name		No. Employees, Members	Phone	No. (Molade Area Cod
Street Address City, State	e and ZIP Code			
Cot San	a and the Gride			
DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(m)).)		DATE(S) INSCR	NUMBATION	YOCK PLACE
RACE COLOR SEX RELIGION	NATIONAL OF	DCINe Earliest		Latest
	NATIONAL OF	ocure 1		NG ACTION
RETALISATION X AGE DISABILITY OF	Supervisor, ervisor to Se insubordina r a black em nd in front of In fact. Orla	In April 2007, uponior Machinist. tion. However, the ployee's work area management. Alturdo has bragged	one of m	ng action  from my  the us used the "N he has been he fact that he
I was hired by MSI on January, 2005 as a Shop vacation, I was told that I was demoted from Shop Superior on the state of extraction of the state of	Supervisor, ervisor to Se insubordina r a black em nd in front of In fact, Orla based on mot.	In April 2007, uponior Machinist.  Ition. However, the ployee's work area management. Altiando has bragged by age (45 at the time RECEIVED	one of mabout the	the as used the *N ne has been ne fact that he
THE PARTICULARS ARE of attendered paper in needed, attach extra sheetall.  I was hired by MSI on January, 2005 as a Shop vacation, I was told that I was demoted from Shop Super on August 2, 2007 I was terminated for alleged employees, Orlando (under 40), has hung a noose over word on several occasions throughout the workplace as written up for these incidents, he is still working at MSI. can get away with this type of behavior.  I believe that I have been discriminated against in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Action	Supervisor, ervisor to Se insubordina r a black em of in front of in fact. Orla based on mot.	In April 2007, uponior Machinist.  Ition. However, the ployee's work area management. Alt ando has bragged by age (45 at the time RECEIVED NOV 1.9	one of meeof mee	nfrom my the as used the "N ne has been ne fact that he y termination),
THE PARTICLEARS ARE of attributed paper in needed, attach exits sheet(s).  I was hired by MSI on January, 2005 as a Shop vacation, I was told that I was demoted from Shop Super on August 2, 2007 I was terminated for alleged employees, Orlando (under 40), has hung a noose over word on several occasions throughout the workplace at written up for these incidents, he is still working at MSI, can get away with this type of behavior.  I believe that I have been discriminated against in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Action of the Age Discrimination in Employment Action of the Age Discrimination of the Age Discrimination in Employment Action of the Age Discrimination of the Age Discrimination of the Age Discrimination in Employment Action of the Age Discrimination of the Age Discrimination of the Age Discrimination in Employment Action of the Age Discrimination of the Agency of the Agenc	Supervisor, ervisor to Se insubordina r a black em nd in front of In fact, Orla based on mot.	In April 2007, uponior Machinist.  Ition. However, the playee's work area management. Altiendo has bragged by age (45 at the time RECEIVED NOV 1 9	one of manual transfer of manual transfer of manual transfer of manual transfer over charge over charg	the as used the *N ne has been ne fact that he y termination),
THE PARTICULARIS ARE of attitionar paper is needed, attach exist sheetial.  I was hired by MSI on January, 2005 as a Shop vacation, I was told that I was demoted from Shop Super on August 2, 2007 I was terminated for alleged employees, Orlando (under 40), has hung a noose over word on several occasions throughout the workplace as written up for these incidents, he is still working at MSI, can get away with this type of behavior.  I believe that I have been discriminated against in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Acceptable to the Age Discrimin	Supervisor, ervisor to Se insubordina r a black em nd in front of In fact, Orla based on mot.	In April 2007, uponior Machinist.  Ition. However, the ployee's work area management. Altiando has bragged by age (45 at the time RECEIVED NOV 1 9 in that I have read the abstrowledge, information a computation of the provided of the prov	one of and habout the of m	the as used the "N ne has been ne fact that he y termination),

EEOC Firm 141-8 (298)

## U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)							
To: Richard Uresti 4119 S. Elm Avenue Lyons, IL 60534		From:	Chicago District Office 500 West Madison St Suite 2800 Chicago, IL 50651				
CER	TIFIED MAIL 7099 3400 0	018 8814 9379		Cricago, ic 66651			
	On behalf of person(s) ag CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR						
EEOC Char	ge No.	EEOC Represent	ative	Telephone No.			
		Rachel Lowe Investigator	en,	(210) 257 2401			
440-2008	440-2008-00911		(Can also	(312) 353-2401 the additional information enclosed with this form.)			
NOTICE TO T	HE PERSON AGGREVED:		(366 860	the appropriate incommunity incomes with this some,			
under Title	VII and/or the ADA based	on the above-numbered ch	arge. It has been issu DAYS of your receip	(ADA): This is your Notice of Right to Sue, issued used at your request. Your lawsuit under Title VII of it of this notice; or your right to sue based on this .]			
	More than 180 days ha	ve passed since the filing of	this charge.				
X	Less than 180 days he be able to complete its	ve passed since the filing of administrative processing w	this charge, but I have thin 180 days from the	vo determined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will e filing of this charge.			
X	The EEOC is terminating	ng its processing of this char	ge.				
	The EEOC will continue	to process this charge.					
Age Discrit 90 days allo your case:	er you receive notice that	we have completed action	on the charge. In this	ny time from 60 days after the charge was filed unti- regard, the paragraph marked below applies to			
X	The EEOC is closing your received	our case. Therefore, your la lpt of this Notice. Otherwit	wsuit under the ADE/ se, your right to sue bi	A must be filed in federal or state court WITHIN ased on the above-numbered charge will be lost.			
	The EEOC is continuing you may file suit in federal	continuing its handling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 days have passed since the filing of the charge it in federal or state court under the ADEA at this time.					
in federal or	state court within 2 years	ave the right to sue under the (3 years for wilful violation; han 2 years (3 years) before	s) of the alleged EPA	charge is not required.) EPA suits must be brough underpayment. This means that backpay due for not be collectible.			
If you file su	it, based on this charge, pl	ease send a copy of your co	urt complaint to this off	ice.			
		John!	On behalf of the Con	3/25/08			
Enclosures	s(n)		John P. Rowe, District Director	(Date Muled)			
oc.	MSI TESTING & ENGINE	ERING					
				N.			
				-			
		Exhibit	В				